

# United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

<b>Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge</b>	Young B. Kim	<b>Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge</b>	
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	08 C 4198	<b>DATE</b>	April 26, 2011
<b>CASE TITLE</b>	Casares vs. Bernal et al		

## DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Plaintiffs' motion for extension of time to file the joint final pretrial order and motions in limine [179] is granted in part and denied in part. Parties are ordered to file their joint final pretrial order and motions in limine by April 29, 2011. All other deadlines scheduled in the court's order of April 14, 2011, to stand. An appearance on May 2, 2011, is not necessary.

■ [ For further details see text below.]

Notices mailed by Judicial staff.

## STATEMENT

Plaintiffs' --- motion for extension of time to file the parties' joint final pretrial order and motions in limine is denied. Beginning in September 2010, the court granted the parties a series of extensions to complete discovery and to prepare for trial. On September 22, 2010, this court granted Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time to depose two EMTs. (R. 133.) Two months later, Plaintiffs were granted a second extension to depose the EMTs. (R. 138.) On November 1, 2010, the court granted Defendants' request for additional time to serve Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures. (R. 147.) Two weeks later the parties reported that they were ready to proceed to trial. (R. 148.) But in January 2011 Defendants moved for an extension of time to file a final pretrial order and motions in limine. The court granted the extension over Plaintiffs' objection. (R. 157.) After allowing Defendants to substitute counsel, on February 10, 2011, this court granted Defendants a second extension and ordered the parties to file their joint final pretrial order and motions in limine by March 31, 2011. (R. 169.)

Despite having objected to Defendants' request for an extension, in March 2011, Plaintiffs sought their own extension of time to file the final pretrial order and motions in limine. On March 29, 2011, Plaintiffs asked for 14 additional days to file the necessary submissions. (R. 171.) The following day, on March 30, 2011, this court granted Plaintiffs' motion and provided the parties 15 additional days to file the necessary submissions. (R. 175.) But then on April 12, 2011, Plaintiffs again asked for more time to file the ordered submissions. (R. 176.) This time, Plaintiffs asked for an extension until April 27, 2011, to file the necessary submissions. The court granted Plaintiffs' motion and amended the trial preparation schedule in order to accommodate Plaintiffs' request for additional time. The court granted Plaintiffs' motion and ordered that the parties file the necessary submissions by April 27, 2011, and warned the parties that the deadlines detailed in the order were firm.

Despite the warning in the court's last order and despite granting the extensions Plaintiffs have sought, Plaintiffs again moved to extend the filing deadline on April 26, 2011, at 1:20 p.m. And the basis for seeking an extension is no different from Plaintiffs' other two motions for extension--their counsel is busy with other matters. Poor

<b>STATEMENT</b>
------------------

<p>planning does not constitute good cause for further extensions. In the five months since the parties reported ready for trial, this court has granted four extensions of time to file the pretrial order and motions in limine---two to Defendants and two to Plaintiffs. These extensions cannot extend into perpetuity and the time has come to draw a line. However, the court grants the parties an extension only until this Friday to file their joint final pretrial orders and motions in limine. Parties must recognize that with this two-day extension, their time period for filing responses to motions in limine is reduced by two days. The court must adhere to the schedule detailed in the April 14, 2011 order to proceed with the jury trial as scheduled in June 2011.</p>
--